

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/767,701	01/29/2004	David K. Kovalic	38-21(53535)B	6459	
66057 MONSANTO	7590 12/17/2008 COMPANY (A&P)	EXAM	EXAMINER		
800 N. LINDE	BERGH BOULEVARD	ZHOU, SHUBO			
MAILZONE I ST. LOUIS, M		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			1631		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			12/17/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/767,701	KOVALIC ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
SHUBO ZHOU	1631		

	SHUBO ZHOU	1631	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 04 November 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following replication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: The period for reply expires	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi ral (with appeal fee) in compliance FR 1.114. The reply must be filed	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ano event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth inter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1,136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of otermining the period of exh under 37 CFR 1,17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1,704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMELINATION. 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, the context of the proposed amendment of the context of	sideration and/or search (see NOT v);	E below);	
appeal; and/or	er form for appear by materially rec	rucing or simplifying ti	ie issues ioi
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: see continuation sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.11		mpliant Amandment /	OTOL 224)
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		ripliant Amendment (- TOL-324).
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:		be entered and an e	planation of
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attach	BQ.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but see continuation sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. Other:			
	/Shubo (Joe) Zhou/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1631	

Continuation of 3(a) and NOTE:

The change from "a fragment" to "the complete complement" of SEQ ID NO.44293 in claims 2, etc. requires further consideration because the amendment substantially changes the scope of the claimed invention. A fragment of SEQ ID NO.44293 in be any partial sequence thereof including one amino add residue while the complete complement is interpreted as being as long as SEQ ID NO.44293 itself and having a sequence complementary thereto.

Continuation of 11:

With regard to the rejection of claims 2 and 4-9 under 35 USC 101/112, first paragraph, applicant argues that the examiner provides no specific evidence that one of skill in the art would have reason to doubt the utility of SEQ ID NO:44293 as a synaptobrevin-like protein. See page 5 of the response. This is not found persuasive because in the previous Office action, it clearly and specifically set forth the reasons why one skilled in the art would have reason to doubt that the claimed sequence encodes a synaptobrevin like protein. See pages 5-7 of the final rejection mailed 94/04.

What is more important, as also set forth in the final rejection, is that even if the sequence indeed encodes a synaptobrevin like protein, it would still require further research to determine how much list activityfunction would be like synaptobrevin protein and what specific and substantial utility the protein might have as Raptis et al. disclose multiple functions for different isoforms. See page 6 of the final rejection. Applicant did not dispute the examiner's position.

As for the rejection of claims 2 and 4-9 under 102(b) over Alexandrov et al., the argument relies on the proposed amendment, which is not entered for reasons set forth above.